



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,514	09/22/2003	Marius Hauri	0100/0165	5820
21395	7590	09/29/2011		EXAMINER
LOUIS WOO				WITCZAK, CATHERINE
LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
717 NORTH FAYETTE STREET				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			3767	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/665,514	HAURI ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
CATHERINE N. WITCZAK	3767	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) CATHERINE N. WITCZAK. (3) _____.
 (2) Louis Woo. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 September 2011

Time: 12:45

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

29-55

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Catherine N Witczak/
 Examiner, Art Unit 3767

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: New claims filed 9/13/11 are identical to the claims which were previously on appeal. The Examiner's rejection of the claims which were affirmed by the Board included a 103 rejection of claims under Crawford as modified by Hudon, wherein the Examiner used the Hudon reference as teaching that it would be obvious to modify the Crawford reference with a rotatably mounted collar as taught by Hudon. With the filing of the new claims, Applicant included a statement disqualifying the Hudon reference as prior art under 35 USC 103(c) because the application and the Hudon reference were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to the assignee of the instant application. Upon updating her search, Examiner found another reference which also teaches a rotatably mounted collar, and can be used instead of the disqualified Hudon reference to modify the Crawford reference. Given that in the previous examination of the claims, certain claims were objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim, but otherwise allowable, Examiner called the Applicant to discuss possibly amending the claims with these limitations to put the claims in condition for allowance, rather than having a rejection sent out in which the Hudon reference is simply replaced with a reference teaching the same rotatably mounted collar, but having a date which qualifies it as a 103 (c) reference. Applicant opted to have the rejection sent out.